

From Specialized Justice to Measurable Enforcement

**Strengthening France's Proposed Response to Sexual and
Intrafamilial Violence**

PPL n° 3106 + PPL organique n° 3107

ILF POSITION

Institutional specialization will matter only if the law requires common, auditable and public tracking of the full case pathway and enforcement of protection measures.

**3 September 2026 | First reading – special committee
Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Research & Policy Institute**

Executive summary

Bills No. 3106 and No. 3107 form a coherent legislative package. The first would establish, among other measures, an independent Authority, specialized judicial formations, specialized judges and prosecutors, and an emergency provisional protection order. The organic bill would embed specialization and periodic training in the statutory framework governing the judiciary.

ILF supports specialization but identifies a central risk: the bill leaves the definition of indicators to secondary legislation, while national comparability, disaggregated publication and enforcement tracking are not guaranteed in the statute itself. A specialized court should be judged not by its existence, but by whether it reduces delay, attrition, protection failures and repeat offending.

1. The legislative package and the intervention point

Filed on 11 August 2026 and referred to the same special committee, both texts remain under consideration. Bill No. 3106 contains 69 articles spanning prevention, policing, justice, protection, children, health, employment, higher education and funding. Organic Bill No. 3107 contains three articles focused on judicial training and the status of specialized judges.

This brief does not summarize all 69 articles. It addresses the provisions where the proposed architecture can be made measurable, comparable and accountable: Articles 2, 5 and 8 of Bill No. 3106 and Articles 1 and 2 of Organic Bill No. 3107.

2. Diagnosis: an ambitious architecture, an incomplete results chain

Article 2 already requires annual reporting by court-of-appeal jurisdiction on processing times, conviction rates, effective access to protection mechanisms and resources. This is a strong foundation. Yet a standalone conviction rate cannot show where cases disappear between report, complaint, investigation, referral, prosecution, adjudication and enforcement.

Article 5 would create specialized formations in every criminal court, court of appeal and assize court, together with a specialized judge. The organic bill requires initial and three-yearly training for certain office-holders. The texts do not establish a public core for training evaluation or comparable measures of workload, team continuity and outcomes before and after specialization.

Article 8 would allow the specialized prosecutor to issue a provisional protection order within twenty-four hours and refer the matter to a judge within six days. Speed of issuance must be measured, but so must service, execution, breaches, resulting intervention and continuity of protection.

3. Targeted legislative recommendations

1

Place a core indicator set in the statute

Amend Article 2 to require, at minimum: recorded incidents; complaints; closures and reasons; referrals and prosecutions; median times; dispositions; convictions; sentences imposed and enforced; repeat offending; and protection orders sought, granted, refused and breached. Publish denominators and definitions.

2

Evaluate specialized courts by outcomes

Amend Article 5 to require pre/post and cross-jurisdiction evaluation of delay, attrition, adjournments, workload per judge, team continuity, dispositions and territorial disparities. Specialization must not become a label without measurable effect.

3

Measure actual enforcement of protection

Amend Article 8 to track decision time, service, execution, breaches, response time after breach and judicial outcome. Distinguish formal access from protection actually delivered.

4

Connect training, competence and review

Amend Organic Bill No. 3107 to require an assessable competency framework, documented three-yearly updating and publication of aggregate training completion. Require an independent three-year evaluation and a five-year parliamentary review clause.

4. Minimum implementation framework

A single national data standard should be adopted before commencement, with definitions, denominators, frequency, quality rules and named producers. Data should be published in open format, subject to confidentiality thresholds, and permit comparison by jurisdiction, offence, sex, age, disability and territory, including overseas territories.

A baseline should be established before rollout. A twelve-month review should measure implementation; an independent thirty-six-month evaluation should measure outcomes and disparities; and parliamentary reconsideration should occur no later than five years after commencement.

Conclusion

Specialization may correct institutional fragmentation, but it does not itself guarantee effectiveness or territorial equality. Parliament should lock the minimum indicator chain, protection-enforcement tracking and a review duty into the statute. That is the difference between an organizational reform and a demonstrably protective reform.

Suggested framework language

PRINCIPLE AMENDMENT

“The report shall publish, under common national definitions and in reusable form, data covering the full case pathway from recording through enforcement of judgments and protection measures. It shall state denominators, median times, reasons for case exit, territorial disparities and breaches of protection measures. An independent evaluation shall be submitted to Parliament within three years of commencement.”

Priority recipients

- Special committee examining Bills No. 3106 and No. 3107
- Ministry of Justice; National School for the Judiciary
- Delegation for Women's Rights; Law Committees
- SSMSI and judicial data-producing services

Sources and methodological note

Desk analysis current to 3 September 2026. The brief applies the Lex Feminae Index® framework: distinguish the existence of a legal rule, access to a mechanism, institutional response and actual enforcement. Recommendations concern monitoring architecture and do not prejudge future parliamentary amendments.

1. Assemblée nationale, Proposition de loi n° 3106, déposée le 11 août 2026, texte intégral: <https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/docs/PIONANR5L17B3106.raw>

2. Assemblée nationale, Proposition de loi organique n° 3107, déposée le 11 août 2026, texte intégral: <https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/docs/PIONANR5L17B3107.raw>

3. Assemblée nationale, dossier de la PPL n° 3106 (statut et commission spéciale): https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/17/textes/l17b3106_proposition-loi

4. Assemblée nationale, dossier de la PPL organique n° 3107: https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/17/textes/l17b3107_proposition-loi

5. Institutum Lex Feminae, Lex Feminae Index® — cadre d'analyse institutionnel: <https://lexfeminaeindex.com>